

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1-25 stand rejected. Claims 1, 13, 20, and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 13, and 15-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choquier, et al., U.S. Patent 5,951,694, in view of Johansson, et al., WO 99/03036.

Amended independent claim 1 now includes the following limitation:

a client device configured to access a first service of the plurality of services by performing the following:

...

 sending a request for the first service to the corresponding service address for the first service.

Independent claims 13 and 23 have been amended to include substantially similar limitations.

Independent claim 20 indicates that the client device is configured to “connect to the first service using the corresponding location information for the first service.”

Choquier does not teach a client device configured for “sending a request for the first service to the corresponding service address for the first service” or “connect[ing] to the first service using the corresponding location information for the first service.” In Choquier, the client address sends a request to open a service to a gateway, which accesses a service map and obtains the location address for the requested service. (See Choquier, column 8, lines 17-24). The gateway then opens a service instance channel and communicates with a server providing the selected service on behalf of the client. (See Choquier, column 8, lines 25-39). The client device in Choquier does not itself obtain the service address for the service and is not configured to send a request to the service address; these functions are performed by the gateway on behalf of the client. As a result, Choquier does not teach a client device configured to access a first service by sending a request for the first service to the corresponding service address for the first service. Furthermore, the client device of Choquier is not configured to connect to the first service using the corresponding location information for the first service, as it is the gateway that forms the connection to the server providing the service. Because all limitations of independent

claims 1, 13, 20, and 23 are not taught, independent claims 1, 13, 20, 23 and their respective dependent claims 2-12, 14-19, 21-22, and 24-25 are allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choquier in view of Johansson. As a dependent claim depending from independent claim 1, claim 4 has been shown to be allowable in light of the combination of Choquier and Johansson for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choquier in view of Johansson and further in view of Fujimoto, JP02001117932A. As dependent claims depending from independent claims 1 and 13, claims 6 and 14 have been shown to be allowable over the combination of Choquier and Johansson for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choquier in view of Johansson and in further view of Al-Ghosein, et al., U.S. Patent 6,473,791. As dependent claims depending from independent claim 1, claims 7 and 8 have been shown to be allowable in light of the combination of Choquier and Johansson for at least the foregoing reasons.


Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choquier in view of Johansson in further view of Bartle, et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,188,888. As dependent claims 10-12 depending from independent claim 1, claims 10-12 have been shown to be allowable in light of the combination of Choquier and Johansson for at least the foregoing reasons.

In summary, each of independent claims 1, 13, 20, and 23 has been shown to be allowable, and the allowability of dependent claims 2-12, 14-19, 21-22, and 24-25 follows. Accordingly, each of claims 1-25 is allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5086.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 17, 2005.




Attorney for Applicants

6/17/05

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



D'Ann Naylor Rifai
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 47,026
Telephone: (512) 439-5086
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099